COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND
COOPERATION IN EUROPE

102d Congress
1st Session

THE CRACOW SYMPOSIUM ON THE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE CSCE PARTICIPATING STATES

A Report Prepared by the Staff
of the Commission on Security and
Cooperation in Europe

1991

J 892-31

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
237 Ford House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

STENY H. HOYER, Maryland, *Chairman*
DENNIS DECONCINI, Arizona, *Co-Chairman*

DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
EDWARD FEIGHAN, Ohio
DON RITTER, Pennsylvania
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
JOHN EDWARD PORTER, Illinois
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia

FRANK LAUTENBERG, New Jersey
TIMOTHY WIRTH, Colorado
WYCHE FOWLER, Georgia
HARRY REID, Nevada
ALFONSE M. D'AMATO, New York
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho
MALCOLM WALLOP, Wyoming
(Senate Vacancy)

Executive Branch

RICHARD SCHIFTER, *Department of State*
STEPHEN J. HADLEY, *Department of Defense*
WILLIAM D. FRITTS, JR., *Department of Commerce*

SAMUEL G. WISE, *Staff Director*
MARY SUE HAFNER, *Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel*
JANE S. FISHER, *Deputy Staff Director*

DAVID M. EVANS, *Senior Advisor for Soviet and East European Affairs*
R. SPENCER OLIVER, *Consultant*

MIKE AMITAY, *Staff Member*
PATRICIA CARLEY, *Staff Member*
BRENDA COLLIER, *Secretary*
OREST DEYCHAKIWSKY, *Staff Member*
JOHN FINERTY, *Staff Member*
ROBERT HAND, *Staff Member*
HEATHER HURLBURT, *Staff Member*
JESSE JACOBS, *Staff Member*

RONALD MCNAMARA, *Staff Member*
JEANNE MCNAUGHTON, *Staff Member*
TOM MURPHY, *Technical Editor*
MICHAEL OCHS, *Staff Member*
JAMES S. RIDGE, *Press Secretary*
ERIKA B. SCHLAGER, *Staff Member*
VINCA SHOWALTER, *Staff Member*
TOM WARNER, *Printing Clerk*

CORINNE ZACCAGNINI, *Office Administrator*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE SYMPOSIUM ON THE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE CSCE PARTICIPATING STATES 1
Summary 1
Background to and Organization of the Meeting 1
U.S. Delegation to the Meeting 3
Context and Opening of the Meeting 3
Working Bodies and Public Participation 5
Proposals, Negotiations, and Document 6
Conclusions 7

MEMBERS OF THE U.S. DELEGATION 9

STATEMENTS OF THE U.S. DELEGATION 11
Opening Statement of Nancy Clark Reynolds, Head of the U.S. Delegation 11
Statement of Ann Guthrie Hingston on Increased International Cooperation in Curbing Illicit Trade in Cultural Treasures 15
Statement of Samuel Gruber on Private Initiatives for Preservation 19
Contribution of Ann Hitchcock on Properties in Heritage Preservation: Examples from the National Park Service 24
Closing Statement of Nancy Clark Reynolds, Head of the U.S. Delegation 31

DOCUMENT OF THE CRACOW SYMPOSIUM ON THE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE CSCE PARTICIPATING STATES 33

REPORT ON THE SYMPOSIUM ON THE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE CSCE PARTICIPATING STATES

Summary

From May 28 through June 7, over 400 delegates met in Cracow, Poland, for the Symposium on the Cultural Heritage of the CSCE participating States. Mandated by the 1989 Vienna Concluding Document, the meeting was originally intended to provide a forum for discussion and an exchange of views among experts in the field of cultural heritage.

The opening and closing plenary session were structured around 6 days of closed working group meetings. Working Group A focused on intangible cultural heritage such as ways of life and language. Working Group B focused on tangible aspects of heritage such as sites, structures, and objects. Unfortunately, the parallel drafting groups, tasked by the symposium with negotiating a concluding document, became the main focus of the meeting. Regrettably, this seriously detracted from the meeting's original purpose: a dynamic exchange among experts in the field of cultural heritage.

After years of CSCE meetings at which agreement on a substantive document was at best illusive if not altogether impossible, the Cracow Symposium illustrated the preoccupation CSCE now seems to have with getting down as many words on paper as possible--while the newly found opportunity lasts--even at the expense of traditional dialogue on implementation. In fact, there was a pervasive view among many participating States in Cracow that a document would provide necessary evidence of the vitality and success of the CSCE process as a whole; that to conclude a CSCE meeting without a document would signal a setback in the process or a continued existence of Cold-War era barriers. Although in the end a substantive document was agreed, it could only be achieved in the limited 2-week framework at the expense of the planned dialogue among experts.

Background to and Organization of the Meeting

The first CSCE meeting devoted exclusively to the field of culture was the Budapest Cultural Forum, held in 1985. A 6-week meeting, the Budapest Forum had mixed results. Frank discussion

of human rights-related cultural problems was possible, but agreement on a substantive document dealing with these problems was not. The meeting was also marred by the unwillingness of the Hungarian hosts to provide full access for nongovernmental organizations. Nevertheless, in the overall context of East-West relations at that time, the meeting was considered a qualified success.

The Cracow Symposium was mandated by the Vienna Concluding Document, at a time when East-West relations were still quite strained. Stemming from a proposal originally introduced by Poland and Austria, the meeting was intended by its proponents to showcase an area where Poland had already implemented considerable reforms, as well as to take advantage of a conference center being built as a joint Polish-Austrian venture. In addition, there was expectation in some quarters that an intersessional meeting on culture would, almost by definition, delve into some of the emerging questions relating to minorities and regional cultures.

At the Paris Summit in November 1990, the CSCE heads of state and government underscored the importance of the Cracow Symposium and invited the Council of Europe to contribute to the meeting. In addition, they resolved to consider further this subject at the Helsinki Follow-up Meeting, scheduled to convene in March 1992. At the same time, the heads also agreed to hold a separate meeting on national minorities, which was convened in July 1991. With the scheduling of a separate meeting devoted exclusively to the subject of national minorities, delegates in Cracow by and large reserved this issue for the July meeting.

According to the agenda, timetable, and modalities set forth in Annex IX of the Vienna Concluding Document (1989), the Cracow Symposium opened with an address by a representative of the host country followed by introductory statements by representatives of the participating States. In addition, contributions were made by UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) and the Council of Europe. These statements lasted a day and a half and were made in open plenaries. Similarly, the symposium concluded with a day and a half of open plenaries reserved for closing statements.

Five half-days were set aside for Study Group A and five half-days were set aside for Study Group B. Study Group A was tasked

with discussing the sources and manifestations of the cultural heritage of the peoples of the participating States, including its contemporary aspects, and access to them; the interrelationship between regional and other features of the cultural heritage; and the role of the sciences and humanities. Study Group B was tasked with discussing implementation of cooperation programs; preservation of the cultural heritage, including socio-economic aspects, and its inter-relationship with the protection of the environment; and the use of modern technical methods and means in the preservation of the cultural heritage and in the dissemination of knowledge about it. Both Groups were to consider the scope for expanding contacts, communications and exchanges of information between institutions, experts and other interested persons in the field of cultures; and the scope for the creation, dissemination, and cooperation.

U.S. Delegation to the Meeting

The U.S. Delegation was headed by Ms. Nancy Clark Reynolds, Vice Chairwoman of Wexler Group/Hill & Knowlton Public Affairs and a Member of the Board of Directors for the National Museum of American Indians and the National Park Foundation. The U.S. Delegation drew its members from several Government agencies, including the National Park Service, the United States Information Agency, the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Helsinki Commission. In addition, the delegation was joined by public members from the World Monuments Fund and the Council on Foreign Relations.

Context and Opening of the Meeting

As a first order of business, Albania requested and obtained consensus to attend the Symposium as an observer. Representatives of UNESCO and the Council of Europe attended as contributors.

After a welcoming message from President Lech Walesa was read, Polish Prime Minister Jan Krzysztof Bielecki opened the Symposium with a speech that was remarkable for its frank assessment of the disastrous impact of communism--"an insane experiment"--on Poland's culture. He stated that, "Poland's communist past is but a 40-year aberration in a history that stretches over a thousand years. Poland's cultural heritage belongs to one thousand years, not to a short-lived experiment imposed on the Polish people, imposed by the artificial line drawn across Europe at the end of the last war. . . . Freedom of the individual,

political freedom, freedom of thought, freedom of expression, tolerance for the ideas of others, these are Poland's true cultural heritage, the very things communism tried to destroy." The Romanian and Czechoslovak representative made similarly blunt and critical assessments of the destructive consequences of communism.

In an apparent rejoinder to Prime Minister Bielecki's remarks, Soviet Minister of Culture Gubenko opened by calling for the delegates to stand in the memory of those Polish and Soviet fighters who had fought to enable Cracow to survive WWII. He then went on to argue that the recent dismantling of the Cracow statue of Soviet Marshall Koniev, commemorating his role in WWII, constituted the destruction of cultural heritage. Minister Gubenko went on to compare Prime Minister's Bielecki's opening remarks to "dancing a tap dance [*chechotka*] on the coffin of the socialist system with all the lightness of a weight-lifter," and asserted that the Prime Minister's remarks lacked the formal politeness required in such settings. Finally, Minister Gubenko criticized two countries, including the host country, for attempting to bring pressure on the internal policies of the USSR. Presumably, this was a reference to Poland's and Denmark's decision to host Lithuanian and Estonian representatives respectively on their delegations.

In response to these remarks, Polish Foreign Minister Skubiszewski summoned the Soviet Charge d'Affaires to complain about the remarks made by Soviet Culture Minister Nikolai Gubenko. Polish media reported that the Polish Foreign Minister said Gubenko's speech "violated the international code of good conduct."

In fact, Soviet indignation appeared particularly disproportionate given the mere token support the Baltic States received for their efforts to join the CSCE. Representatives from Lithuania and Estonia continued to be relegated to "guest status," a title that is essentially the same status as that available to any member of the public and only permits access to non-secured areas of the conference facilities. (Latvia chose not to attend the meeting.) During the opening remarks, U.S. Head of Delegation Reynolds welcomed the Baltic presence.

Although there was considerable support among the participating States for extending observer status to the three Baltic States, and the Helsinki Commission continued to urge that the United

States formally table a proposal to that end, the Soviet Union again privately indicated that it would not give consensus to any proposal for Baltic observer status. Consequently, delegations in Cracow declined to take any action on the Baltic situation which might be interpreted by the Soviets as "confrontational." During the course of the meeting, there was a public demonstration in front of the Forum Hotel, where the Study Group sessions were held, calling for Baltic independence and Baltic participation in the CSCE process.

Working Bodies and Public Participation

As an integral part of the CSCE Symposium on the Cultural Heritage, Cracow, Poland, May 28 to June 7, 1991, two sessions of working groups were scheduled. The topics for intervention by the participating delegations were quite diverse, focusing on the cultural heritage and its protection, past, present and future. Consensus was reached on May 31 to permit the representatives of the Council of Europe and UNESCO to respond to questions or comments expressly addressed to them, with the explicit proviso that this would not be regarded as setting any precedent for future meetings.

The study group process involved formal sessions in the morning and afternoon sessions with a rotating chair. The topics discussed ranged from evaluation of the arts and cultural heritage in Europe as a general topic, to such specific ones as the protection of historic monuments or archives in specified locations depending upon the presentation by the speakers. Specific programs for improving cooperation and communication among the participating nations ranged from special exhibitions to which several members might contribute and support, such as the "Bronze Age" in European archaeology proposed by Sweden to cooperative ventures for the protection of modern films of the twentieth century as an exercise in conservation of materials. Throughout the oral presentations, and in several of the papers submitted, stress was placed on the numerous examples of cooperation which presently exists and is working, but which yet requires additional efforts to expand such efforts in order to more adequately deal with the varieties of cultural needs among the participants. Ireland, for example, proposed that artists-in-residence programs would facilitate such cooperation among the CSCE members, a project which was seconded by some other participants. A broad range of cultural programs was discussed, some repeatedly, in the area of media as a means to facilitate the expansion of the cultural heritage, technical

methods in use by various nations to protect their patrimony, legal systems for the protection and preservation of the cultural properties, and training or educational programs as a means to enhance further the common theme of cooperation and communication among nations. A number of East European delegations drew attention to the cultural losses incurred by their 40 some years under authoritarian rule. The American delegation contributed both in the form of comments to statements made by others as well as formal interventions. The responses at the end of the formal sessions offered by representatives of the Council of Europe and UNESCO were considered a welcome contribution by the experts.

Proposals, Negotiations, and Document

The Vienna mandate for the Cracow Symposium did not require the adoption of a document, and instead anticipated that "projects and proposals submitted to it will be forwarded by the Government of the host country to the next Follow-up Meeting." Indeed, the prospect of trying to draft a substantive document among 34 countries in 9 short working days minimized the likelihood of achieving a document and reflected the Vienna mandate's original focus on an exchange of views. But the Cracow meeting reflected the fundamental shift in attitudes toward the CSCE process which had emerged since the conclusion of the Vienna Follow-up Meeting: that is, a majority view had evolved which considered a document necessary evidence of the vitality and success of the CSCE process as a whole and that, accordingly, the failure to produce one would suggest insurmountable conflicts where none really exist. Although the United States expressed concern that such drafting sessions would detract from the exchange of views envisioned by the mandate and provided for in the working groups, by the end of the first week a parallel drafting group was formed and tasked to meet in tandem to the Study Groups.

Beginning with the second week, this drafting group engaged in marathon negotiations, working into the early hours of the morning or, in the case of the secretariat staff, all night. All in all, 35 proposals were introduced during the course of the meeting, most of which concerned a specific subject or area of concern. A few, however, were broadly drafted attempts to embrace the range of issues conceivably arising within the scope of the meeting. These proposals, along with some non-papers, ultimately formed the basis for a coordinator's draft document, and were introduced or

circulated by the Pentagonale countries (Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Italy, and Yugoslavia); by Poland, the host country; by France; and by the 12 member-states of the European Community. Of the more specific proposals, many of them were grafted on to the coordinator's text.

During the negotiation process, there was little discernable coordination among traditional negotiating groups, with the notable exception of the Pentagonale. Even there, however, group discipline largely manifested itself in the introduction of formal proposals, rather than in response to draft texts on the table. Disagreement on draft language often stemmed from different views among the participating States regarding the nature and degree of government involvement in the field of culture and the willingness of some countries to commit to additional financial responsibility in this area. Nevertheless, in the end, the Cracow meeting produced the longest amount of agreed text in the shortest amount of time in CSCE history.

The document ultimately agreed includes some new substantive commitments, although it also includes language that is somewhat repetitive of previously agreed CSCE texts. Among the themes that appear throughout the document is an emphasis on tolerance and diversity and a recognition of the important role of non-governmental actors in preserving cultural heritage. The document also noted the valuable contributions of the experts from the two Study Groups. These contributions will be deposited with the CSCE Secretariat in Prague which will, in turn, make them available to the public.

Conclusions

The Cracow Symposium illustrated the now pervasive view among many CSCE states that a document provides necessary evidence of the vitality and success of the CSCE process as a whole; that to conclude a CSCE meeting without a document signals a setback in the process or the continuation of Cold-War era barriers. Although in the end a substantive document was agreed, it could only be achieved in the limited 2-week framework at the expense of the planned dialogue among experts.

The meeting was generally considered a success from the perspective of those seeking a document. But from the perspective of many of the cultural experts attending the meeting, the format

of traditional CSCE working sessions was not conducive to a dynamic exchange of views--a criticism shared by experts at some other CSCE meetings, notably, the London Information Forum. In this vein, it was suggested that future meetings of this nature should be structured to allow for more informal discussions among experts.

MEMBERS OF THE U.S. DELEGATION

Ms. **NANCY CLARK REYNOLDS**, Head of Delegation
Mr. **JOHN EVANS**, Deputy Head of Delegation,
United States Department of State
Ms. **ANN HITCHCOCK**, Chief Curator, National Park
Service of the United States

Ms. **DEBORAH GLASSMAN**, United States Department
of State, Executive Secretary
Ms. **ANN GUTHRIE HINGSTON**,
Mr. **DAVID WHITTEN**, United States Information Agency
Mr. **WILLIAM GLADE**, Associate Director,
United States Information Agency
Mr. **SAM GRUBER**, World Monuments Found
Ambassador **FRANCES COOK**, United States Ambassador
to Cameroon
Ms. **ERIKA SCHLAGER**, CSCE Commision of the United States
Ambassador **SAM WISE**, CSCE Commision of the United States
Ms. **JANE FISHER**, CSCE Commision of the United States
Mr. **JOSEPH MACMANUS**, Senior Public Affairs
Mrs. **SUSAN BALL**, Deputy Public Affairs Adviser,
United States Consulate General, Krakow
Mr. **REX MOSER**, United States Information Agency,
Staff Member
Mr. **ROBERT BUSH**
Ms. **JACQUELINE B. McNULTY**

Mr. **ALGIS AVIZIENIS**, Consul.
Mr. **RENE BEBEAU**, Vice Consul
Mr. **DOUGLAS M. BERRY**, Consul.
Mr. **WILLIAM SLAVEN**, Vice Consul.
Mr. **MICHAEL D. KIRBY**, Consul.
Ms. **SARA KIRBY**, Administrative Assistant.

Ms. **JANINA GALAS**
Mr. **BOGUSLAW PEDRACKI**
Ms. **BARBARA ZAK**
Ms. **MALGORZATA SIEKLINSKA**
Mr. **TADEUSZ WYWIAL**
Mr. **TOMASZ KSIAZEK**
Mr. **ZBIGNIEW CZOSNEK**

STATEMENTS OF THE U.S. DELEGATION

Opening Statement of
Nancy Clark Reynolds
Head of the U.S. Delegation
May 29, 1991

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Colleagues, and Guests:

I bring you special greetings from the second largest Polish-speaking participating State and I am delighted to join others in thanking our Polish hosts and the Executive Secretariat for the wonderful welcome and excellent arrangements they have made for us here at this symposium.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to inform fellow delegates that our delegation is expecting our Vice President Dan Quayle to be here in Krakow next Thursday. With the cooperation of the Executive Secretary, we expect all delegates will be invited to hear an address by the Vice President here in this beautifully restored theater.

Less than 3 years ago, when agreement was reached to convene this symposium, few of us would have predicted that we would be meeting in such transformed circumstances. Although the process of change continues, we already speak to each other on the basis of shared values in a way that was not possible before. The barriers that used to separate us along political lines are gone.

Before we found it necessary to throw cultural bridges across the political divisions that kept us apart. Now we are finding that culture provides a common ground for all the peoples of Europe and North America. Our cultural heritage is diverse. The preservation and understanding of that heritage, and of each others' cultures, is essential.

Mr. Chairman, we have always considered the CSCE to be an appropriate forum for discussing issues of importance to all the peoples of Europe and North America. We welcome the presence among us today of representatives of the Baltic peoples and fully understand their interest in the proceedings of this symposium.

At the most personal level, culture defines each one of us as an individual. It is through culture that individuals, peoples, and nations express their identities. Individual creativity arises from diverse cultures and can have both universal value and world-wide impact. Think of Frank Lloyd wright from our country. Think of Czeslaw Milosz. Think of Josef Brodsky who, by the way, has just been elected Poet Laureate of the United States. Think of Vaclav Havel. Time and again, people have found strength in their cultural resources when dealing with hardship, oppression and intolerance. Culture and religion sustained millions of immigrants to America, some of whom traveled as free men and women, others of whom made the voyage in chains. But it was the rhythms of Africa, distilled in America, that produced that wonderful jazz, which America in turn gave to the world.

History teaches us, of course, that culture can also contribute to ethnic prejudice, to intolerance, and even to violence. When cultural values are shared willingly, this can lead to creativity and mutual benefit, enriching society as a whole. But when they are imposed by one group on another, these values can be destructive.

All the countries represented in this beautiful theater--and many that are not--have contributed to the diversity of the United States. As a consequence, our citizens do not share just one ancestry or a single culture. What they do share is a commitment to tolerance and a respect for diversity that each generation of Americans had to learn for itself. Our experience has taught us that the preservation, protection, and interpretation of the cultural heritage of diverse groups is absolutely essential. And it will succeed only through the direct involvement of those groups. Sensitive and controversial historical sites, so-called "blank spots," give us a chance to teach tolerance and make room for alternative points of view. For example, a camp where Japanese-American citizens were unjustly interned during World War II has recently been recognized by the United States as a National Historic Landmark as an expression of our national remorse. And the new Smithsonian Museum of the American Indian, on whose planning committee I sit, will recognize both the sufferings and the contributions of our Native American population.

Citizen involvement--what we in the United States call "grass-roots" (I don't know if that is translatable)--is the cornerstone of "civil society." It is particularly important today, as many CSCE

participating States experience unprecedented change. As democracies develop new laws, policies, and programs, their planning must be sensitive to the cultural heritage of affected groups. Their direct participation is needed if the process is to be truly democratic. Partnerships among concerned local, regional, and national groups, from both the public and private sectors, are needed to interpret the many facets of the cultural heritage effectively.

Now, some people on this side of the Atlantic laugh when they learn that the United States has no Ministry of Culture. In fact, we would find it hard to imagine a single official in charge of culture since so many cultures in the United States exist and everyone is a Minister of Culture.

Support for the arts in the United States is based on a dynamic partnership of governmental and non-governmental groups. Government support for culture serves mainly as a catalyst to stimulate private support and to foster an environment where cultural endeavors can flourish in all their diversity. Nearly 83 percent of the support for the arts in the United States comes from private contributions, 12 percent from local and state governments, and only 5 percent from the Federal Government. This partnership involves a wide range of groups in support and appreciation for the arts. We have also developed additional support mechanisms: government grants linked to private contributions, tax incentives, volunteer activities, and apprentice programs as well.

Local organizations have been at the heart of the historic preservation and the environmental movement both in North America and in Europe. Here, in Krakow, independent environmental groups ably drew attention to the urgent need to control the environment in order to protect not only the population, but also the cultural heritage of this World Heritage Site. We are proud to be involved with the city of Krakow in a multi-year program designed to improve air and water quality. Clearly, as many speakers have stressed, cultural resources are inextricably linked to their natural environment: their significance, integrity, and preservation is dependent on environmental contexts and conditions.

Mr. Chairman, the cultural heritage is an important part of the human dimension and of the international civilization that we are all a part of. Although we value our differences, we increasingly share a common commitment to certain values, among them

48-888 - 91 - 2

individual liberty, political pluralism and economic freedom, the rule of law, and freedom of expression. This shared heritage makes possible the dialogue that we are embarking upon in just a few hours.

The study groups that are about to meet are of the utmost importance to me and my delegation. We have already learned a great deal this week, and we are eager to learn much more. When we return to Washington, we will be reporting to non-governmental organizations and to the Helsinki Commission. We would like to be able to report that there was a real exchange of ideas here, and not simply another document for its own sake.

We agree with those speakers who have urged that the experts here exploit the opportunity of being together for this short period. Their discussions should be the main event.

So in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say how pleased we are that, in place of those things that have divided us, today we see emerging the outlines of shared history and heritage, shared problems and solutions, and, most importantly, a shared vision of the future.

Thank you.

Statement of Ann Guthrie Hingston
on
Increased International Cooperation
in Curbing Illicit Trade in Cultural Treasures
June 3, 1991

We welcome this opportunity to say a few words about U.S. support for the 1972 Convention on the World's Cultural and Natural Heritage and the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property. The United States is very active in carrying out its obligations under these conventions and pays dues to UNESCO for this purpose. The United States sits on the UNESCO World Heritage Intergovernmental Committee and a number of natural and cultural sites in the United States are listed on the World Heritage list.

The topic I wish to address is international cooperation to curb trafficking in stolen and looted cultural treasures and the need for better communication about this subject. As you are aware, the United States has a strong tradition of free enterprise and private property rights. Most American museums are private institutions with private boards of directors. We believe there is a genuine role for legal commerce in art works. However, the United States has undertaken a number of administrative and legal measures that promote international cooperation in protecting cultural treasures.

In the United States, implementation of the 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property is overseen by the President's Cultural Property Advisory Committee. The Committee consists of archeologists, art dealers and representatives of the museum community and the general public and it is quite serious about its responsibility. Since the United States is the only major importing country to implement the cultural property Convention, we seek better communication and cooperation with other nations--both the major art importing nations and those whose cultural property are in jeopardy.

The United States is able to cooperate with nations that are party to the 1970 UNESCO Convention on cultural property in two ways--by cooperating with the recovery of stolen inventoried cultural property and by cooperating in protecting uninventoried

archeological and ethnographic materials. In both cases, the U.S. law provides that we may cooperate only when we are asked to do so by another state party.

The 1983 Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act outright prohibits the entry into the United States of any article of cultural property that has been stolen from a public collection, monument, a church, or a museum in a country that is party to the Convention. The object must have been stolen after April 1983 and after the date the Convention went into force for the state party where the object is inventoried. In order for our efforts to be effective, it is important that the U.S. Customs Service be notified of the theft of art objects as soon as possible. This may be done by contacting INTERPOL, which issues stolen art alerts or by having your embassy in Washington notify the U.S. Customs Commissioner directly. Another information network is available by using the services of the New York organization called the International Foundation for Art Research, which publishes a monthly magazine on stolen art that is read widely by the American art community. The International Foundation for Art Research has recorded the loss of thousands of stolen art objects. Their records are being computerized with the assistance of Lloyds of London and several international auction houses. Soon they will be opening an office in London.

The other major provision of the U.S. Cultural Property Act, which implements the 1970 cultural property convention, is concerned with stopping the looting of archeological and ethnographic materials in order to advance scholarly research about earlier civilizations. Upon the request of a state party under Article 9 of the Convention, the United States is able to impose an import ban that prohibits the entry into the United States of specific types or categories of artifacts yet to be recorded or inventoried but that are in current jeopardy from pillage. The U.S. import ban requires importers of such objects to provide proof of legal export from the country of origin. In order to obtain an import ban, a state party must officially request such action by sending a diplomatic note and background information to the Director of the U.S. Information Agency in Washington.

During the last five years, five nations have asked the United States for import bans. Presently, the United States prohibits the importation of certain pre-Columbian artifacts from El Salvador,

Bolivia, Peru, and Guatemala. A request for a bilateral agreement from the government of Canada is under consideration.

In addition, the United States has instituted several other remedies that promote cooperation in this area, that are in the spirit of the 1970 UNESCO cultural property Convention:

Annually, the U.S. Customs Service seizes numerous articles of cultural property on the basis that they were smuggled or fraudulently declared. Recognizing the importance of cultural objects to other nations, the U.S. Customs Service has taken administrative action to offer to return cultural objects to the country of origin instead of selling the object to benefit the U.S. Treasury. In such cases, the U.S. Customs notify your embassy in Washington to ascertain whether the art object may have come from your country.

Nearly 20 years ago, the U.S. Congress and President Nixon became outraged by the plunder of the ancient Maya civilization in Guatemala and Mexico and other pre-Columbian civilizations in the Western hemisphere. A U.S. law was passed that prohibits the entry into the United States of all pre-Columbian immovable cultural property which has closed the U.S. art market for portions of pre-Columbian temples, murals, and stelae. We regret, however, that these ancient pyramids continue to be destroyed to supply the international art market.

The efforts I have mentioned have focused on cooperative efforts to safeguard moveable artifacts essential to a nation's cultural patrimony that remain in the country of origin. Often we are asked the question about how one may recover artworks or cultural property in U.S. private collections and museums that entered the United States prior to 1983. Only if a U.S. law is violated may the Federal Government assist with such cases. However, there are other avenues that of which you should be aware and that I wish to emphasize.

We suggest that you engage in a professional dialogue with the U.S. museum or institution, or private collector, where the artwork resides. There have been instances in which U.S. museums have returned artworks or arranged for long-term loans or exhibitions. This is often done quietly through professional networks without much publicity.

The other recourse to recover artwork is to bring a civil suit in U.S. court. In recent years, the U.S. courts have made a number of decisions that have been favorable to foreign claims for the recovery of art. The most publicized case most recently litigated involved the Greek Cypriot church and the Government of Cyprus against an Indianapolis art dealer who had purchased, in Switzerland, a 6th century mosaic taken from a church in northern Cyprus. The court awarded the mosaics to Cyprus declaring that the Government of Cyprus had displayed due diligence in publicizing the theft of the mosaics but that the art dealer had not applied sufficient diligence in researching the provenience of the mosaics. This decision further emphasized the need to publicize the loss of cultural treasures to discourage innocent purchasers.

We provide the previous information with the hope that other countries will join us in combating the illicit movement of cultural treasures. The United States urges all nations, especially its fellow major art importing nations, to implement the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property. The President's Cultural Property Advisory Committee, located at the U.S. Information Agency in Washington invites a dialogue with each of you to promote bilateral and multilateral cooperation in safeguarding endangered archeological and ethnographic materials.

Thank you.

Statement of Samuel Gruber
on
Private Initiatives for Preservation
June 4, 1991

Yesterday,[1] I referred briefly to the role of the private sector in preservation. I did not mean to give the impression that private groups act alone in preserving America's cultural heritage--particularly its architectural heritage. Quite the contrary, the private sector is able to work effectively because governments--local, State, and Federal--have created a framework of laws, tax provisions, and review bodies that encourage the spirit of preservation. Partnership between the private and public sectors is the norm in America, though the details of each partnership are as different as the many types of projects.

In large works such as the restoration of Union Station in Washington, or Quincy Market in Boston, both of which now serve mixed uses and have stimulated significant economic development, government has been a major participant. Nonetheless, the challenge of restoring buildings, even public ones such as libraries and university buildings, is not perceived principally as a government responsibility in the United States.

Buildings or monuments which were often built by private individuals or through public subscription are most often restored through the raising of public funds--outside the tax structure. Not-for-profit groups organize the projects, collect the funds and use them to hire private building and restoration experts. Two recent well-known examples of such efforts on a very large scale are the Statue of Liberty and Carnegie Hall in New York, but one could easily list thousands of other examples including every kind of structure.

On a smaller scale, owners of small properties are encouraged or required, through local landmark and zoning laws, to preserve historic buildings. Historic districts which have been designated increasingly throughout American cities and towns such as Savannah, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and countless other places, allow individual preservation of houses and smaller commercial buildings within a context of controlled development.

---

[1]Extemporaneous remarks before Study Group B.

The principle of creating historic districts, borrowed and adapted from efforts in many other CSCE countries which have long records of historic preservation of older architectural heritage--such as in Italy, France, Holland, and Great Britain, to name only a few--is still evolving in America, and it is increasingly being adapted to residential non-monumental neighborhoods, often of quite recent date.

Of course, there are always problems. In a country with a strong constitutional tradition protecting private property, may owners initially resist even slight restrictions on the development of their properties. Twenty years of aesthetic and economic benefits of historic districts, however, are now convincing most doubters.

As you probably know, the Constitution of the United States separates church and state. This means that there is no aid of any kind, except tax-exempt status, given to religious bodies or their buildings. In our country, in fact, it is the religious institutions that most vigorously resist having their buildings designated as historic monuments, citing the interference of government in their affairs. Many such cases are now pending in the United States courts.

In many places, such as my own Community Board #9 in New York City (known to most of you as Harlem), there is strong public agitation for more--not less--designation of protected historic sites. Upon my return to New York, I will be testifying at a public hearing concerning the designation of 25 Harlem buildings as historic sites, in order to protect their architectural integrity and prevent the possibility of future demolition. We anticipate that this is only the beginning of a major effort to protect the cultural heritage of this area.

In America, private groups (NGOs), from the underfinanced by highly committed Committee for Progress through Preservation in Harlem to the larger, nationwide National Trust for Historic Preservation, dictate, for the most part, the preservation agenda. These are aided by many preservation programs at universities, such as Columbia University, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Georgia. Hundreds and probably thousands of preservation organizations exist throughout the country. Policy, for the most part, is dictated from the bottom up.

As a preservation professional, I wish that in response to public pressures the government would sometimes act faster and more generously. But all in all, I think America's system has worked well. I believe that small scale private efforts have done more for preservation, and for improving peoples lives in the process, than most large-scale governmental interventions.

Because American preservation organizations rely on constant public support for their very existence, they must constantly engage the public in a dialogue, and try to educate the public, too. Most of all, preservation organizations are forced to stay in touch with people. Recent developments in the preservation of vernacular architecture (rightly emphasized by the delegation of Bulgaria), and in the preservation of commercial architecture, including signs and store-fronts as well as entire buildings, have been fostered by groups such as the Vernacular Architecture Forum and the Society for Commercial Archaeology. This has led to a broader view of what the cultural heritage is. In the case of America we now recognize that turnpikes and parkways (types of roadways) and gasoline stations are a part of American-built heritage, and define aspects of our culture, just as log cabins, white-painted New England churches, and 18th-century brick rowhouses do. We have learned from a European ethnographic tradition and adapted this to American needs. As its people are diverse in their origin, America's architecture is rich and varied, too.

We are increasingly recognizing diversity in other ways too, some that are not as flattering to our past as we would like. Slave quarters are as much a part of Southern American history as are the Greek revival plantation houses prominently featured on tourist brochures. Sweatshops, mills, and tenements are part of Northern American heritage as much as French Empire-style city halls or Gothic Revival college campuses. Increasingly, such buildings, with their original interiors (but without the suffering) are being preserved to remember the past and to teach the future. I recommend to anyone visiting New York City a visit to the Lower East Side Tenement Museum. Americans are often accused of having short memories, but in these cases we do want to remember where we came from. First, from the great cultures of Europe and Asia and Africa. But also from our immigrant struggles in a new country. Because so many Americans came to the United States to escape persecution or economic deprivation, this is important to emphasize, too.

We must remember that cultural heritage is not always honorable. Likewise, we must restrain ourselves in over-celebrating spirituality. Faith is a two-edged sword as the history of Europe teaches us. The Crusader's bloody path across Central Europe, when Jews were murdered and synagogues burnt, the Thirty Years War, the Wars of Religion and the Expulsion of the Jews and Moors from Spain, all remind us that when we celebrate the culture of the visitors, we should also pause for more than a moment to commemorate the vanquished. The 20th century has been particularly brutal, and we must remember this part of our culture, too, at Verdun, Auschwitz, and elsewhere.

We must learn how to address culturally and historically sensitive sites, to present both sides of the story. We should all share our methods for preserving sites of shame as well as sites of glory.

Needless to say, in America more attention is now paid to a more truthful and comprehensive presentation of Native American history. The recent film, "Dances with Wolves," is symptomatic of a reaction to past cultural stereotyping. I hope it is just the beginning. In America, as we celebrate next year the arrival of Columbus, we recognize that the Europeans brought the end--through war and disease--of another great civilization. We applaud the efforts of Spain to pair its celebration of Columbus with the commemoration of the expelled Jews who Columbus's three ships passed as he sailed from Spain. We also support Turkey's efforts to celebrate the reception of these same refugees in the lands of the Ottoman empire.

We all know how complex history is, and how careful we must be in preserving it. Every act of preservation is in essence also the creation of something new. Just as archeological excavation involves destruction, so too preservation means invention.

In other areas in America, too, diversity is being stressed. As in other countries, development is threatening historic landscapes. In this area, we have a public tradition: the National Park Service has long protected scenic and historic lands. We also have a strong private tradition. It was John D. Rockefeller who bought land on the Hudson River across from Manhattan to create Palisades Park. Fortunately, it can never be built upon. Today, public groups with

memberships in the tens of thousands, such as the Nature Conservancy and the Trust for Public Land are bargaining as tenaciously as real-estate developers to purchase threatened land parcels. These groups, which subsequently often sell or give their purchases to the government, can act faster in emergencies or in times of government budget constraints. Great Britain has similar programs as we have heard. The principle is simple: just as some people give great paintings to museums to preserve them for posterity, so, too, some groups give great land--and often the endowments to maintain them. Such contributions are usually tax deductible.

We have no illusions that our system can or will be adopted by other countries with different histories and where governments traditionally play a larger financial role in protecting cultural heritage. We hope, however, that some examples of American preservation initiatives, especially those that have proven adaptable, compatible, and competitive in a free market economy, might give ideas for a new programs elsewhere. Several incentives in Poland and Czechoslovakia already come to mind. Recently, organizations such as the World Monuments Fund, where I am Director of the Jewish Heritage Council, have been very successful in establishing affiliates in other countries such as Italy, France, and Mexico. World Monuments Fund (WMF), unlike most private American preservation organizations, carries out most of its work abroad. It was formed as a result of UNESCO's call for international aid to Venice after the floods of 1966. During 25 years of work, WMF has carried out over 50 projects worldwide, and we have almost 25 projects underway, many through our European Heritage preservation program, financed by the Samuel Kress Foundation. Now, our new affiliates, seeing a role for private initiative and aid in preservation, and realizing that private citizens can often help their governments in pursuing the preservation of cultural, and in particular architectural, heritage, are working on their own.

To conclude, the United States believes that an even broader role for private initiative in preservation can be developed worldwide, always working within the careful guidelines of national and internationally respected preservation organizations, institutions, and agencies.

Thank you.

Contribution of Ann Hitchcock

on

Properties in Heritage Preservation:
Examples from the National Park Service
prepared paper

Many values, priorities, needs and actions are associated with heritage preservation. The following list identifies certain principles and values to which the National Park Service has given priority, and cites examples of associated actions that the National Park Service has taken to realize those principles and values.

1. PARTNERSHIPS

Partnerships among diverse local, state, and national private, non-profit, and governmental organizations are essential to preservation that is effective and representative of the many facets of the cultural heritage.

The National Park Service (NPS) gives high priority to forging new and strengthening existing partnerships. In 1990 Secretary of the Interior Manuel Lujan launched the American Battlefield Protection Program under the auspices of the National Park Service to seek innovative ways to protect American Battlefields where historical significance and growth pressures called for quick action.

The establishment of this partnership program was motivated by the government's recent lesson in the economics of historic preservation. In 1988, plans for a regional shopping mall, houses, office buildings and a hotel were proposed on privately owned lands (adjacent to Manassas National Battlefield Park) that had played a significant part in the Civil War Battle of Second Manassas. The development would have destroyed the unprotected historic site and affected the cultural landscape and viewshed of the long-protected park. The U.S. Congress in a rare "legislative taking" moved to purchase the property at a price that has risen to more than $ 135 million. All involved recognize that additional protection of important and representative historic sites is not feasible at such prices and without a broad base of interest and economic support. In a new approach to battlefield protection Secretary Lujan has begun partnerships with local governments, states and preservation organizations, and was instrumental in the creation of the Congressionally authorized Civil War Sites Advisory Commission. He has worked with the private sector to create the American Battlefield Protection Foundation, a non-governmental organization, dedicated to raising $ 100 million to support battlefield protection. The Program has targeted 25 Civil War sites in urgent need of protection and will begin to study and prioritize additional sites. As time and resources permit the partnerships will expand to include protection of additional battlefields from the Civil War and other wars on U.S. soil.

The National Park Service has long standing partnerships with State Historic Preservation officers and Certified Local Governments to carry out preservation work at the state and local levels, e.g., surveys, planning, and grants for preservation work.

2. PROTECTION OF DIVERSE CULTURAL HERITAGE

Preservation, protection, and interpretation of the values, heritage and material culture of diverse groups is essential and will succeed only through the direct involvement of those groups.

The units of the National Park System and National Historic Landmarks are classified according to a thematic framework in an attempt to gain broad and representative coverage of the cultural heritage of the United States. This thematic framework is dynamic and adjusted as concepts of history and cultural heritage change.

For example, Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho, tells about the origins and heritage of the Nez Perce tribe, westward expansion and exploration, as well as military and Native American conflict. The National Historical Park consists of a Visitor Center and 24 interpretive sites that are located within the Nez Perce Indian Reservation and along roads outside the Reservation. The interpretive sites are in various ownerships, i.e., with the tribe, NPS, the State, private parties, or other Federal agencies. The preservation, protection, and interpretation of the sites is managed by the National Park Service in consultation with the tribe and the other parties. Approximately 30% of the staff positions at the site are designated for Native Americans.

Clearly, the fundamental relationships that often exist between park resources and the integrity of contemporary Native American and other cultures necessitate that the National Park Service consult with affected communities before reaching decisions about the treatment of traditionally-associated resources. Many units of the National Park System encompass traditional use sites, such as shrines, vision quest sites, or traditional sites for gathering native plants for food, medicine, or other uses. The legislation for some units, such as those recently established in Alaska, specifically provides for Native subsistence uses in park areas. In other parks, Native American uses are protected by policy rather than legislation. At Bandelier National Monument, New Mexico, a community of archeological sites in the Southwest, public access has come into conflict with ongoing Pueblo Indian use of the Shrine of the Stone Lions. National Park Service management decisions regarding public use of the shrine, location of trails near the shrine, identification of the shrine on park maps and brochures for general distribution, and requests by Native Americans for use and closure of the area must all be considered in consultation with the affected Native American groups.

Often Native American uses or needs conflict with traditional park uses or preservation procedures and new understandings and standards must be brought to bear. A case in point, which has received international attention, is the issue of Native American grave protection and repatriation. Whereas archeologists have traditionally excavated Native American graves and associated objects as part of their systematic and scientific investigations of Native American occupations and heritage, this practice is now greatly curtailed on Federal lands and for Federally funded projects, as well as for many States' lands and projects. The 1990 "Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act" states ownership and control of human remains and associated funerary objects resides with the descendants or affiliated tribe and these remains and objects may only be excavated under permit issued pursuant to the Archeological Resources Protection Act and after consultation with the appropriate Native American tribe. Likewise existing holdings of human remains, associated funerary objects, and sacred objects in museums must be inventoried and upon request of a culturally affiliated Native American tribe, repatriate (i.e. return) the remains and objects.

Though many archeologists and museums initially opposed this legislation, most have come to view it as a sign of the strengthening of Native American cultural heritage. The Federal government, in fact, has taken a number of steps to further preservation of Native American heritage. Under the auspices of the National Historic Preservation Act, the National Park Service, in partnership with the states, local governments, Indian tribes, and private organizations and individuals, provides leadership in prehistoric and historic preservation, and provides financial and technical assistance. It has established a Tribal Preservation Program and provides technical assistance and coordinates direct grants to Indian tribes for the preservation of their cultural heritage. In fiscal year 1991 $ 750,000 was provided. Many of the grants have been applied to language and archival preservation.

3. INTERPRETATION OF SENSITIVE SITES

The opportunity to interpret sensitive and controversial sites must be sought and approached by clearly articulating all points of view.

We understand and learn from our past only when we acknowledge our mistakes as well as our achievements. For this reason, the interpretation of sites of a sensitive or controversial nature is important.

Manzanar War Relocation Center, a World War II Internment Camp in California, for persons of Japanese descent (most of them American citizens), was established in 1942. Here, in a scrubby desert, 10,000 of these people were forcibly removed from their homes and herded into barracks, without being accused of any crime or given any hearing or trial, allegedly as a security measure against sabotage and espionage. Eventually, most Americans came to the conclusion that a grave injustice had been caused these people and their constitutional rights had been violated. Meanwhile, the vast majority of Japanese Americans remained loyal to the country despite this great adversity. Manzanar is symbolic of this drastic event in American history, an event that is a reminder that a nation of laws needs constantly to honor the concept of freedom and the rights of its citizens. Today, only traces of the community remain and the desert looks much as it did before the camp was built. In 1985 the Secretary of the Interior designated Manzanar a National Historic Landmark. It is currently being considered for addition to the National Park System.

Wounded Knee Battlefield, South Dakota, was designated a National Historic Landmark in 1965. Situated on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, it is the site of the last significant clash between Indians and U.S. troops in North America. In a period of uneasiness, following the introduction of the Ghost Dance among the Dakota, a Sioux band led by Big Foot fled their reservation. Stopped by U.S. troops in December 1890, they had given themselves up at Wounded Knee when shooting suddenly started and large numbers of Big Foot's band were killed. The site is currently under consideration for addition to the National Park System. Draft legislation calls for an apology to the Sioux by the U.S. Government and financial compensation to the descendants. U.S. Army documents and Sioux oral tradition are at variance about what happened that day. Both accounts need to be preserved and told. While there remain different viewpoints on what took place at Wounded Knee, there can be no disputing the fact that a major threshold had been crossed and the relationship between the United States Government and Indian peoples had irrevocably changed. The National Park Service firmly believes that it is both appropriate and timely to recognize this event and work towards its commemoration.

4. DOCUMENTATION

One of the most important legacies to cultural heritage that can be provided to future generations is complete and lasting documentation of sites, structures, cultural landscapes, objects, and cultural systems as they presently exist.

Visual and written documentation of cultural resources is essential to their accurate ongoing maintenance and interpretation. Deterioration of the original resource is inevitable, though a conducive environment and appropriate treatment and maintenance is effective in slowing the rate of deterioration. Because change is inevitable, documentation at any point in time is invaluable. In addition, archivally-sound methods must be used to ensure the longevity and utility of the documentation.

Recognizing this need, under the auspices of the National Park Service, the Historic American Buildings Survey and the Historic American Engineering Record produces measured drawings, large format photographs, and written histories on historic sites, structures, and cultural landscapes that are significant to the architectural, engineering, maritime and industrial heritage of the United States. Documentation, which meets archival standards, has been produced on more than 25,000 sites and structures. These records, housed at the Library of Congress, form one of the largest architectural collections in the world. The drawings form the basis for restorations, historical research, and a vast range of other preservation purposes. Beyond this, the drawings, photographs, and written records are often the only remaining permanent evidence of the many historic structures that continue to be lost. In fact, one-third of the HABS/HAER collection (started in 1933) documents places that no longer exist. The publication and dissemination of the published drawings helps to guard against loss of the documentation.

In partnership with scholars and experts from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, efforts to document, understand, and interpret the social and historical context of the Russian Bishop's House in Sitka and the significance of the missionary parishes represented in the churches throughout Alaska greatly enhanced the opening and presentation of the House to the American public. Two Soviet architects were assigned in Alaska to work on Historic American Building Survey documentation procedures for the Holy Ascension Church in Unalaska. With the assistance of the Andrei Rublev Museum in Moscow, further work on the studies and restoration of icon paintings and related arts and architecture is anticipated.

The Historic Sites Act of 1935 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to identify and recognize properties of national significance (National Historic Landmarks) in United States history and archeology. Today 1,900 National Historic Landmarks are listed. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 authorized the Secretary to expand this recognition to properties of local and State significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture that are worthy of preservation. The National Register of Historic Places, which now includes more than 57,000 entries, is the official list of these recognized properties, and is maintained and expanded by the National Park Service on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior.

The National Park Service is currently emphasizing the documentation of resources within the units of the National Park System. This documentation includes automated inventories of an estimated 50,000 archeological and 35,000 ethnographic sites, 15,000 historic structures, undetermined numbers of cultural landscapes, and more than 25 million museum objects. These inventories can link with other databases to meet expanded research, management, and interpretive needs. The automated National Catalog System, recording museum objects, is in use in more than 250 parks in the National Park System and has been acquired by more than 200 non-NPS sites/museums, making it one of the most widely distributed object cataloging systems in the world. Current emphasis is on applying geographic Information System mapping techniques to a wide variety of cultural resource data, providing the manager with a tool to synthesize large quantities of information into a more readily understood graphic image.

The NPS recently established an applied ethnography program to systematically document the heritage concerns of Native Americans and other communities with longstanding ties to park cultural and natural resources. The program will enhance our understandings of the symbolic historical and contemporary relevance of all park resources from the viewpoint of people who use or made them.

The National Park Service is responsible for the National Archeological Database (NADB), an annotated listing of reports of archeological investigations done throughout the United States. The number of reports is estimated to be 200,000 and growing at a rate of 10,000-20,000 per year. The reports encapsulate the data and interpretations of archeological resources that have been destroyed, typically because of modern development, as such, they are essential records of the archeological heritage. NADB is organized as a national network of contributors and users including Federal, State and other public agencies, as well as universities, libraries, museums, and archeologists in private companies.

All successful documentation systems must have longevity. Automated systems must be periodically updated to maintain parity with new software and hardware developments; almost nothing is more useless than automated documentation that is not readable on any existing machines. Likewise paper used in documentation must be durable. In 1990 a new law (Public Law 101-423) was enacted to establish a national policy on the use of acid free permanent paper for Federal records, books, and publications of enduring value. The measure recommends that American publishers and state and local governments voluntarily use acid free paper for significant publications and instructs the Secretary of State, Librarian of Congress, and Archivist of the United States to inform foreign governments and international agencies of this public policy. This policy will ultimately save millions of dollars now spent on conserving brittle papers in archives and books. As part of this effort the National Park Service has published technical information on making archival quality photocopies for permanent records and as an alternative means to saving the content, if not the original fabric, of deteriorated historic documents. (see NPS Conserve-O-Gram 21/4, "Preservation through Photocopying")

5. DEVELOPING PRESERVATION KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

The dissemination of knowledge and skills, especially vanishing skills, through training, exchange of personnel, research, and technical publication is necessary to ensure continuity in cultural preservation.

The United States has a dearth of skilled craftspeople to provide specialized maintenance on and treatment for historic ships and structures. Despite the significance of maritime culture in American history, maritime preservation has not received much attention. In fact, many of the skills necessary to historic vessel preservation are rare and rapidly disappearing. In 1984 the National Park Service, which manages a fleet of 10 preserved large historic vessels, the largest such fleet in the United States, was mandated by Congress, in coordination with the National Trust for Historic Preservation, to inventory the historic maritime resources of the United States, prioritize the needs of those resources, and provide guidance on a standardized, systematic approach to sound preservation of these resources. As of 1991 the inventory identifies 250 preserved large historic vessels currently subject to a preservation plan. In 1990 the National Park Service issued the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Vessel Preservation Projects with Guidelines for Applying the Standards. In spite of this Maritime Initiative, the preservation of large historic vessels remains tenuous. Since the 1985 inventory 11 historic vessels have been dropped because they were no longer preserved. Yet research and experimentation with new techniques have led to encouraging successes, such as the treatment of dry rot in Wapama, the last serving West Coast "steam schooner", with sodium borate, a non-toxic, environmentally sound compound that had not been used heretofore for remedial treatment of dry rot. Dissemination of information on this new technique is important to furtherance of the body of maritime preservation knowledge.

Though preservation of historic structures has had a higher profile than maritime preservation, it still suffers from a lack of skilled technicians. In fact, aside from random acts of destruction by people or nature, the single largest threat to historic structures lies in the cumulative day-to-day impact of inappropriate or inadequate maintenance techniques. Consequently, the National Park Service is giving priority to programs that address this need to train craftspeople who are not only highly skilled in a trade, but also embrace preservation philosophy and can apply it. The NPS Williamsport Preservation Training Center undertakes preservation projects at sites throughout the National Park Service, using them for on-the-job training. In fiscal year 1990 the center completed 36 projects at $ 1.5 million.

Through cooperative agreements and partnerships, the National Park Service is working with non-governmental preservation training organizations in preservation skills development. Under a cooperative program sponsored by the U.S. Committee of the International Council on Monuments and sites (ICOMOS), students and young professionals from approximately 20 countries with ICOMOS national committees have joined HABS/HAER summer teams (see priority 4) annually to document America's historic places and industrial landmarks by preparing drawings, photographs, and written histories. One of the best ways to ensure the continuity of preservation skills is to pass those skills from person to person, country to country, and generation to generation.

Complementing the skills that reside in the craftspeople, is the collective body of knowledge in publications that are widely disseminated by the National Park Service. Technical publications series documenting preservation techniques for structures include topics from historic window treatments to manufacture of architectural metals (see Preservation Tech Notes, Preservation Brief). Archeological publications topics range from site stabilization methods and techniques to the organization of public education and volunteer programs. Similar publications for museum objects include the National Park Service Museum Handbook and Conserve-O-Grams. New additions to these series are published frequently. Draft Federal legislation proposes to establish, within the National Park Service in partnership with other organizations and government agencies, a Preservation Technology Center that would serve to further research and the collection and dissemination of information on preservation technology and techniques on a nationwide basis.

6. PLANNING

Planning, and the laws, regulations, policies, and programs that result from planning, underpin all effective preservation efforts.

Historic preservation is effective only when it occurs within the context of a systematic plan that is supported by complementary historic preservation laws, regulations, policies, and programs. A body of Federal preservation laws establishes criteria for determining the historical/cultural significance of sites, structures, landscapes and objects and sets standards for preserving and protecting those resources. The National Park Service administers the National Register of Historic Places and reviews and accepts nominations and determinations of eligibility made by the States for sites, structures and objects that are determined to be of local, state, or national significance. The head of any Federal agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or federally assisted project, prior to the approval of any Federal funds or issuance of a license, must take into account the effect of that undertaking on any district, site, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for the National Register. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and State Historic Preservation Officer review such undertakings and determine whether the undertaking will have an effect on the resource. If an adverse effect is determined then the agency must take an acceptable course of action to mitigate the effect on the resource.

Through this process of establishing criteria for significance, evaluating the effect of proposed undertakings, and mitigating adverse effects to best serve the public interest, the Federal government ensures that its actions will give fair consideration to historic preservation values before any construction or other alterations occur. Likewise, through the preservation tax incentives program the Federal government encourages non-governmental owners of certain types of properties to rehabilitate historic structures according to established Federal Standards for Rehabilitation. More than 22,000 projects have qualified since 1976, representing $ 15 billion of investment). States have similar historic preservation laws and review processes to ensure that historic preservation starts at the planning stage of development.

7. CULTURAL HERITAGE PRESERVATION AS AN ETHIC

To effectively combat loss and deterioration of cultural heritage, much of which occurs through ignorance, neglect, and willful destruction, cultural heritage preservation must become an ethic.

In 1990 the Secretary of the Interior initiated a major program for public agencies to enhance the preservation of archeological sites. One aspect of this program is deterrence of archeological looting and vandalism through increased arrests. The National Park Service has established LOOT, a clearinghouse of information on prosecutions of looted and vandalized archeological resources on public lands. Rather than deterrence, however, it is the educational side of this program that has the potential to instill a wider appreciation of historic preservation that can establish it as an ethic accepted by diverse groups within the population. The National Park Services publishes a Listing of Education in Archeological Programs (LEAP), an automated database listing Federal, State, local, and private projects, programs, and products that promote public awareness of American archeology. In addition nearly 2.9 million "Take Pride in America" archeological preservation bookmarks, with six regional designs, have been distributed on request to such parties, as schools, libraries, museums, state offices, Indian tribes, and community organizations. The bookmarks are now scheduled for bilingual release in English/Spanish. The National Register of Historic Places contributes to the development of school curricula on historic preservation. Even a coloring book, "The Great American Landmarks Adventure", has been developed to convey the message of historic preservation.

The value of cultural heritage preservation is also communicated through laws passed by Congress and the standards, guidelines, and regulations promulgated by the National Park Service and others. But only a small percentage of the general populace is aware of these laws and guidelines. Broad based educational programs for young people are likely to have a greater impact in instilling cultural heritage preservation as an ethic.

8. CULTURAL RESOURCES ARE LINKED TO THEIR ENVIRONMENT

Cultural resources are inextricably linked to their natural environment: their significance, integrity, and preservation is dependent on environmental context and conditions.

Cultural landscapes have often been ignored by the historic preservation movement. This condition has led to such anomalies as a Civil War battlefield (Petersburg National Battlefield, Virginia) bounded by a multiple story Federal housing project. To reverse this trend and preserve these resources and their associated viewsheds, the National Park Service is currently inventorying its cultural landscapes and revising standards for ensuring that cultural landscape values are taken into consideration in the planning process as well as writing guidelines for the treatment of landscapes.

Not only does the environment impact cultural resources in terms of context, but it has a direct impact on its physical condition. Air pollution, excessively high or low relative humidity or temperature, precipitation and moisture, light, and pests are factors of the environment that may impact sites, structures, cultural landscapes, as well as museum objects in the indoor environment.

The National Park Service is grappling with providing guidance on interior environmental control for historic structures containing museum objects. Often the conditions that are optimal for the objects may be deleterious to the structure. For example, installation of a Heating-Ventilating-Air Conditioning (HVAC) system to maintain a constant temperature for historic furnishings, may cause condensation in the walls of a historic structure in a cold climate.

Similarly the external environment, especially that part of the environment that is man-made, e.g. air pollution, is of major concern. The life span of cultural materials may be shortened significantly by the products of fossil fuel combustion, i.e., sulfur and nitrogen compounds, organic and mineral acids, and various atmospheric oxidants (ozone, peroxides). Materials that are at risk include selected architectural materials (marble, limestone, some sandstones, bronze and other metals). Granite, concrete and ceramic materials are generally unaffected by air--or rain--borne pollutants. Control of pollution emissions for health standards may not be sufficient to protect cultural property for the long-term. Emission controls in the vicinity of individual monuments may be necessary, such as restricting vehicles within specified zones around the site, or optimizing a building's ventilation system to limit infiltration of outdoor pollutants.

Since 1980 the NPS has participated in multi-agency research efforts evaluating acid precipitation, including its effect on cultural resources. Results have been shared at international meetings. In addition, a joint study with NPS, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Polish Academy of Sciences is underway to develop a dehumidification plan for the 17th century St. Anthony Chapel in the Wieliczka Salt Mines, Cracow.

SUMMARY

The above examples describe only a small part of the many actions that the U.S. Government, through the National Park Service, undertakes on a daily basis to further cultural heritage and historic preservation. Yet the accomplishments are small in relation to the magnitude of the need. Clearly, valuable cultural heritage is being lost worldwide and all peoples and nations need to give higher priority to cultural heritage and historic preservation--even to preserve only the most significant resources.

Ann Hitchcock
Chief Curator
National Park Service

Closing Statement of
Nancy Clark Reynolds
Head of the U.S. Delegation
June 6, 1991

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Colleagues, and Guests:

Last Sunday, I had a wonderful opportunity to visit a small village in the mountains about 2 hours from here. There I visited three families of craftsmen and women who carve some of the charming wooden figures we have all seen in the local markets of Krakow.

Of the many warm memories of that delightful day, the clearest I have is of two small children. In the faces of those children, I saw the legacy of their parents and grandparents. I saw, too, in those faces the promise of the future--not only for them and their families, but for all of us and for all of our children.

That day with those three Polish families made it clearer to me why the subject of this Symposium is so important. The cultural heritage is not only about our past. It is about our present and our future. It is not only about preserving and respecting the achievements of our ancestors. It is about ensuring that such achievements are possible in the future.

But to do so requires more of us than the preservation of monuments and artifacts. It requires positive efforts to ensure that the wonderful creative process is open to the influences of other cultures, not only from Europe and North America, but from many others as well. Let us have confidence in our own cultural traditions and not be afraid that they will be lost if exposed to other cultures. If we're going to fail in this responsibility, we will fail to leave to future generations a cultural heritage that is as alive and vibrant as the inspiring performances we have seen in the remarkable old buildings of Krakow.

In my country, we say that a camel is a horse designed by a committee. But a camel is very useful--sometimes it's better than a horse for transport. Likewise, the final document of this Symposium may not be the sleek animal we envisioned when we started.

But it is a reasonably good document for transporting us to where we want to go. I think it will serve us well.

Mr. Chairman, in my opening remarks I expressed our belief that the main event of this Symposium should be the discussion of the experts. We hoped that we would learn from those discussions, and we did. Our delegates return to the United States much better informed and more knowledgeable of the many efforts underway and planned throughout Europe to restore, preserve, and interpret the cultural heritage.

Mr. Chairman, the arrangements of our hosts have truly been extraordinary, not only for the Symposium itself but also for the rich cultural and travel programs provided. Let me share with you at least one example of cooperation that has emerged as a result of those programs. A group of enthusiastic participants has just formed, as of yesterday, an international committee to assist with the restoration of the beautiful Renaissance city of Zamosc in eastern Poland.

I particularly want to thank our hosts for making the appearance of our Vice President possible, and to thank all of you for your courtesy in attending the Vice President's speech despite the early hour.

I'll be leaving Cracow in just a few hours, and I take with me the firm conviction that the dreams of the people of this part of the world will surely be realized. I know they will because last Sunday, I saw the hope and determination in the faces of two small children and their families in a little village in the mountains of Poland.

Thank you, good-bye. I hope we meet again.

Dziekuje. Do widzenia.

DOCUMENT OF THE CRACOW SYMPOSIUM ON THE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE CSCE PARTICIPATING STATES

The representatives of the participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, the Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg-European Community, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Yugoslavia met in Cracow from May 28 to June 7, 1991, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Agenda and organizational modalities of the Symposium, as set forth in the Vienna Concluding Document, and with the provisions of the Charter of Paris for a New Europe. Albania attended the Symposium as an observer. Contributions were made in accordance with the above-mentioned documents by UNESCO and the Council of Europe.

The Symposium was opened and closed by the Minister of Culture and Fine Arts of Poland and was addressed by the Prime Minister of Poland.

Opening statements were made by all Heads of Delegation among whom were ministers of culture of a number of participating States.

The participating States welcome with great satisfaction the profound political changes that have occurred in Europe. They underline the contribution made by culture in overcoming the divisions of the past and in strengthening co-operation among the participating States.

The participating States express their deeply held conviction that they share common values forged by history and based, *inter alia*, on respect for the individual, freedom of conscience, religion or belief, freedom of expression, recognition of the importance of spiritual and cultural values, commitment to the rule of law, tolerance and openness to dialogue with other cultures.

They take note of the interrelationship between cultural life and the well-being of their peoples, and the special importance that this has for democratic countries in transition towards a market economy. They encourage support, as already undertaken, afforded and the on-going assistance to those countries in preserving and protecting their cultural heritage.

The participating States respect the irreplaceable uniqueness of all their cultures and will endeavour to promote continued cultural dialogue among themselves and with the rest of the world. They reaffirm their belief that respect for cultural diversity promotes understanding and tolerance among individuals and groups.

They consider that the regional aspects of culture should in themselves constitute a factor in the understanding between peoples.

Regional cultural diversity is an expression of the richness of the common cultural identity of the participating States. Its preservation and protection contribute to building a democratic, peaceful and united Europe.

Reaffirming their commitment to the full implementation of the provisions relating to the cultural dimension in the Helsinki Final Act and other CSCE documents, the participating States agree on the following:

I. Culture and Freedom

1. The participating States emphasize that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is essential to the full development of cultural creativity.

2. The State and the public authorities will refrain from infringing upon the freedom of artistic creation.

3. The participating States undertake to promote and protect the free and unhindered development of artistic creativity; they recognize the important role of the individual artist in society and will respect and protect the integrity of creative work.

4. They recognize the need for governments to strike a balance between their dual responsibility of acting in support of, and ensuring the freedom of, cultural activity.

5. They further acknowledge that, given the variety of cultural activity in the participating States, there are many ways in which governments might choose to respond effectively to concerns relating to the cultural heritage.

6. The participating States recall their respect for freedom of expression and, in connection with the exercise of that freedom in the artistic and cultural fields, state as follows:

6.1 The publication of written works, the performance and broadcasting of musical, theatrical and audiovisual works, and the exhibition of pictorial or sculptural works will not be subject to restriction or interference by the State save such restrictions as are prescribed by domestic legislation and are fully consistent with international standards.

6.2 They express their conviction that the existence, in the artistic and cultural fields, of a diversity of means of dissemination independent of the State, such as publishing houses, radio broadcasting, cinema and television enterprises, theatres and galleries, helps to ensure pluralism and the freedom of artistic and cultural expression.

7. The participating States recall their commitments to unhindered access to culture, and agree as follows:

7.1 While duly respecting intellectual property rights, any person or independent organization has the right to own privately, use and reproduce all kinds of cultural materials, such as books, publications and audiovisual recordings, and the means of reproducing them.

8. The participating States are resolved to promote the mutual knowledge of their respective cultures. Accordingly, they will encourage co-operation and exchanges in all fields of culture and creative work.

9. The participating States are convinced of the enrichment which regional and local cultures, including those connected with national minorities, bring to cultural life.

II. Culture and Heritage

10. The participating States express their deeply-held conviction that the cultural heritage of each one of them constitutes an inalienable part of their civilization, their memory and their common history, to be transmitted to future generations.

11. The participating States take note of the definitions of archeological property, of the cultural heritage and of architectural heritage in the relevant international documents of the Council of Europe and UNESCO.

12. The complete and lasting documentation of sites, structures, cultural landscapes, objects and cultural systems, including historical, religious, and cultural monuments, as they presently exist, is one of the most important legacies to the cultural heritage that can be provided for future generations.

13. The participating States also recognize as vital elements of their common cultural heritage, the heritage of those cultures which, because of language barriers, climate and geographical distance, limited population or turns of history and political circumstances, have not been widely accessible.

14. The participating States will endeavour to protect the cultural heritage, in compliance with relevant international agreements and with their domestic legislation.

15. The participating States will pay heed to the preservation, enhancement and restoration of the cultural heritage when drawing up cultural, environmental and regional and urban planning policies. They further note the importance of relating individual conservation projects to their authentic urban or rural environment, where appropriate and whenever possible.

16. The participating States recognize the importance of making their cultural heritage as widely accessible as possible. In doing so, they will pay particular attention to the needs of the handicapped.

16.1 They will endeavour to safeguard the heritage from damage which may be caused by management of and public access to it.

16.2 They will promote public awareness of the value of the heritage and the need to protect it.

16.3 They will seek, whenever possible, to facilitate access for researchers and scholars to relevant primary documents and archive materials.

17. The participating States note favourably the role of non-governmental associations in promoting awareness of the heritage and the need for its protection.

18. Partnerships among diverse groups at the local, regional and national level, from both the private and the public sector, are valuable for ensuring the effective and representative preservation of the cultural heritage. The preservation and interpretation of the values and the cultural heritage of diverse groups will be enhanced with the involvement of those groups, which is conducive to the tolerance and respect for different cultures which are of paramount importance.

19. The participating States recognize the usefulness and importance of exchanging information on preserving the cultural heritage and acknowledge that the use of data banks, on a national and multilateral level, could make a useful contribution to this work.

III. Principal Areas of Preservation and Co-operation

20. The participating States will encourage training, at the initial and advanced levels, for the various professions and crafts involved in preserving and restoring the cultural heritage, as well as in administering it. They agree to keep one another informed of any important developments in this field and to co-operate with one another.

20.1 The dissemination of knowledge and skills, especially vanishing skills related to the cultural heritage, through training, the exchange of personnel, research and technical publication, is necessary to ensure continuity in cultural preservation. They therefore reaffirm their commitments to encourage bilateral and multilateral exchanges of trainees and specialists.

20.2 The participating States should invite the appropriate professional organizations to set up a national register of skilled craftsper-

sons competent in the field of the protection and preservation of the cultural heritage, in order to facilitate contacts between such persons and the users of their services both nationally and internationally.

21. The participating States will exchange data on their cultural heritage policies, particularly regarding the methods, means and possibilities provided by new technologies.

22. The participating States will strive to share their knowledge and experience in the area of publishing and distribution of printed and audiovisual material.

22.1 With a view to increasing public awareness regarding the preservation of the cultural heritage, the participating States will make information available that will assist radio and television stations, as well as the print media, to promote information in this area.

23. They will endeavour to improve storage conditions for perishable cultural goods such as paper, film tapes and recorded sound materials, to establish national programmes for the preservation of the perishable cultural heritage and to set commonly accepted standards for all types of carriers of cultural products in order to safeguard the permanence of such items of culture.

24. The participating States will encourage the establishment of links between resource centres and data banks in cultural fields so as to facilitate the exchange of information between them.

25. With a view to a better understanding of the cultural values of the countries whose languages are less widely spoken, the participating States welcome the dissemination of knowledge about and of such languages, in particular through the translation and publication of literary works from these countries. The organization of international training courses for media and cultural personnel involved in promoting the understanding of less-spoken languages and less widely-known cultures should also be considered.

26. Acknowledging the important contribution of religious faiths, institutions and organizations to the cultural heritage, the participating States will co-operate closely with them regarding preservation of the cultural heritage and pay due attention to monuments and

objects of religious origin whose original communities no longer use them or no longer exist in the particular region.

27. Bearing in mind the important role that regional aspects of culture may play in linking people across national borders, the participating States will favour regional co-operation at the level of local and national authorities as well as non-governmental organizations with a view to fostering good-neighbourly relations.

28. The participating States will accord due attention to strengthening the heritage of popular culture of the past, including indigenous and vernacular cultures, and to encouraging a contemporary popular culture within the framework of their overall efforts for the preservation, study, protection and promotion of mutual awareness of their cultural heritage. The participating States note the importance of research into various forms of expression of past and present cultures--symbolic practices, technical objects and knowledge, folk art, languages--and the importance of doing what is necessary to highlight them.

29. The participating States will also pay attention to more recent contributions to the cultural heritage (art, including architectural works, of the 20th century).

30. The participating States will co-operate in preventing the illegal circulation of cultural objects, for example, by considering adhering to the relevant international instruments.

31. The participating States will strive to preserve and protect those monuments and sites of remembrance, including most notably extermination camps, and the related archives, which are themselves testimonials to tragic experiences in their common past. Such steps need to be taken in order that those experiences may be remembered, may help to teach present and future generations of these events, and thus ensure that they are never repeated.

32. The interpretation of sensitive sites of remembrance can serve as a valuable means of promoting tolerance and understanding among people and will take into account social and cultural diversity.

33. The participating States recognize that, in defining priorities for preservation, it is important to take into account both the

intrinsic value of the cultural heritage, its relative state of deterioration and its historic cultural content. To this effect they will, as appropriate, endeavour to promote the use of risk charts, the exchange of information and the organization of on-site workshops, ideal also for the involvement of younger generations.

34. The participating States bear in mind that the preservation of the status of monuments and sites related to their history and culture, wherever they are located, constitutes an integral part of the overall efforts within the CSCE for the preservation and protection of the common cultural heritage.

35. The participating States believe that taking concerted measures to protect the common cultural heritage from environmental damage is necessary. To this end they will consider establishing or joining networks for the collection of data and co-ordination of research. They will endeavour to co-ordinate policy decisions and undertake direct measures to reduce the impact of air pollution and other degradation on the common cultural heritage.

36. With a view to protecting cultural sites in urban environments, measures will be taken by the participating States to counteract the effects of pollution on the architectural complexes of threatened cities; to restore, preserve and revitalize historical urban centres; and to safeguard sites and protect them from damage due to the increasing flow of tourists.

37. The participating States note the importance of protecting the cultural landscape, particularly in villages and rural areas, from the danger inherent in changes in the pattern of economic activities, and in the impact of pollution, with a special view to protecting dwellings and coherent ensembles of the everyday living environment.

38. In view of the contribution which natural history can make to our understanding of the world of today and its evolution in the future, the participating States will endeavour to foster the preservation and interpretation of natural history sites and collections.

39. The participating States note the importance of safeguarding public and private parks and historical gardens, as works of humanity and nature, due to their historical, botanical and social interest, including their decorative and architectural elements.

40. The participating States will endeavour to safeguard and protect the archaeological sites located on their territories, including sites located under water. They will bear this aspect in mind during regional development operations which are likely to be a threat to sites which have not yet been scientifically surveyed, excavated or restored.

41. They stress the need for co-ordination of the activities of international organizations and institutions, such as the Council of Europe and UNESCO, in order to contribute to the full development of cultural co-operation among the participating States. Bearing in mind the need to avoid duplication of effort, the participating States will co-operate closely within the competent international organizations to which they belong.

* * *

42. The participating States welcome the positive contribution made by the representatives of UNESCO and the Council of Europe to the proceedings of the Cracow Symposium on the Cultural Heritage. They note that the work and activities of UNESCO will be of continuing relevance to the CSCE's consideration of cultural issues. They further acknowledge the Council of Europe's rich experience and expertise in cultural matters, in particular in protecting the European cultural heritage, and agree to consider appropriate ways in which the participating States might make use of the Council of Europe in the context of the CSCE's work in this area.

43. In the two Study Groups many experts from the participating States spoke on national experiences, and put forward ideas on areas of co-operation in the fields of cultural exchange and the preservation of cultural heritage, in particular on those aspects outlined in the mandate assigned to the respective groups. These contributions, copies of which will be deposited with the CSCE Secretariat, greatly contributed to the success of the Symposium. The participating States expressed their intention to pursue further these initiatives in appropriate international fora.

44. The representatives of the participating States expressed their profound gratitude to the people and Government of Poland for the excellent organization of the Symposium and the warm hospitality extended to the delegations which participated in the Symposium.